R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 002 993 24

RESPONSE PATTERNS ASSOCIATED WITH GROUP COUNSELING.

BY- OHLSEN, MERLE M. PROFF, FRED C.
ILLINOIS UNIV., URBANA, COLL. OF EDUCATION

REPORT NUMBER CRP-934 PUB DATE 60
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.40 35P.

DESCRIPTORS- *COUNSELING, COUNSELING TECHNIQUES, GROUP COUNSELING, GROUP THERAPY, *INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP, INTERPERSONAL PROBLEMS, *MEASUREMENT, PREDICTIVE MEASUREMENT, PREDICTIVE ABILITY (TESTING), *COUNSELORS, PSYCHOLOGISTS, *BEHAVIOR DEVELOPMENT, BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS, BEHAVIOR PATTERNS, GROWTH PATTERNS, GRADE 9, URBANA, ILLINOIS

FURTHER ANALYSES OF DATA COLLECTED IN AN EARLIER STUDY (ED 002 992) WERE CONDUCTED TO DETERMINE EFFECTS OF SELECTED GROUP COUNSELING FACTORS INCLUDING (1) RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CLIENT GROWTH AND TOPICS DISCUSSED IN GROUP COUNSELING SESSIONS, (2) EFFECTS OF GROUP COMPOSITION ON COUNSELING GROUP INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIORS, AND (3) WAYS OF MEASURING CHANGES IN CLIENTS' BEHAVIOR. INTERACTIONS AMONG NINTH GRADERS AND PROSPECTIVE COUNSELORS WERE CLASSIFIED IN TERMS OF EFFECT, REFERENT, AND TOPIC. FOUR PSYCHOLOGISTS (NOT PREVIOUSLY CONNECTED WITH THE STUDY) ARRANGED PROTOCOLS OBTAINED FROM A PICTURE-STORY TEST IN ORDER FROM PRETEST TO FOLLOWUP TESTS FOR THE NINTH GRADERS AND THEIR PROSPECTIVE COUNSELORS. THEN THE EFFECT OF CHANGE ON PROTOCOL ARRANGEMENT WAS DETERMINED. INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIORS OF CLIENTS AND PROSPECTIVE COUNSELORS WERE THEN GROUPED UNDER THE CATEGORIES OF APPROACH, ATTACK, AND WITHDRAWAL. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE, CHI SQUARE, AND RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS WERE THEN PERFORMED. MAJOR OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY WERE NOT ACHIEVED. CUES USED TO ARRANGE PROTOCOLS, HOWEVER, SUGGESTED MEANINGFUL QUESTIONS FOR SUBSEQUENT ANALYSIS. (WN)

RESPONSE PATTERNS

Associated With Group Counseling

Cooperative Research Project No. 934

MERLE M. OHLSEN and FRED C. PROFF

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA, ILLINOIS

1960

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

RESPONSE PATTERNS

ASSOCIATED WITH GROUP COUNSELING

Cooperative Research Project No. 934

Merle M. Ohlsen and Fred C. Proff

College of Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

1960

ED002993

34.14A
16d

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	The Abstract	1
	Merle M. Ohlsen	
II.	Client Growth as a Function of Affect and Topic in Group Counseling	6
	Table 1	14
	Table 2	15
	Table 3	16
	Table 4	17
	Table 5	18
	Merle M. Ohlen Merritt C. Oelke	
III.	The Influence of Composition of the Group on Interpersonal Behavior in a Counseling Group . . .	19
	Fred C. Proff Robert Clever	
IV.	Group Counseling Evaluated by Blind Analysis of Projective Test Responses	21
	Tables 1, 2, 3, & 4	30
	Merle M. Ohlsen Harold Johnson	

Chapter I

The Abstract

M. M. Ohlsen

This report presents the findings of phase three of a research report designed to investigate the success with which group counseling can be applied in an educational setting. Inasmuch as its results are based upon data collected for Cooperative Research Project No. 623 (Ohlsen and Proff, 1960), this report is a supplement to it.

The Problem

While sharing ideas and helping each other resolve problems each met in completing his work for Project No. 623, the staff noted certain response patterns that seemed to warrant further study. Two were closely related to the topic of discussion: (1) Does it make a difference what topics clients discuss and who discusses them? (2) Do those who talk most about themselves profit most from counseling? Another was a direct outgrowth of the work by Katz, Ohlsen, and Proff (1959): To what extent does composition of the group influence interpersonal behavior of adult clients in group counseling? The final question was raised concerning response patterns noted in certain clients' picture test stories: Can competent psychologists take randomly arranged protocols and arrange them in order from pre-testing to follow-up testing?

Related Research

Though some therapists have said that it does not make any difference what clients discuss, most believe that it does. In fact, many believe that clients will make best growth when they talk about themselves and the things that bother them most. In general, Talland's and Clark's (1954) research supported this notion. They found that their patients rated the topics which were most disturbing as most helpful.

With reference to question number 3, Katz, Ohlsen, and Proff were able to identify and to analyze important interactions in group counseling. Though they questioned whether this method could be used with only tape recordings, it appeared worthwhile to try it.

Finally, the last question was concerned with a global interpretive judgment of adjustment. The investigators assumed that even if the clinicians were not able to reliably make the judgments required that useful cues may be obtained for better content scoring. Though most related studies were completed with hospital patients, the evidence suggested that the question was worthy of study with reasonably well-adjusted clients. Rogers and Dymond (1954) found that raters judged protocols taken before

therapy as less well-adjusted than those taken after therapy. Cowden, Deabler, and Feamster (1955) and Zimmer (1955) also found that raters were able to differentiate between levels of adjustment with blind analysis of projective test data.

Procedures

Sample

Data for this project were obtained from the two groups of under-achieving adolescents for which all the counseling sessions had been kinescoped. Originally, the proposal called for the analysis of only two of the five groups of prospective counselors, but since satisfactory tape recordings were available on three, Ohlsen and Oelke used three of the adult groups. Ohlsen and Johnson used picture story protocols from all four groups of adolescents and five adult groups.

The Treatment

The ninth graders were counseled twice a week for a period of eight weeks. They were excused from study hall for these sessions. Immediately following termination and evaluation of counseling for the experimental group, group counseling was provided for the two control groups. They also were used as their own control group. It was these last two groups which were kinescoped.

The prospective counselors met for one hour twice a week for seven weeks. A different counselor was employed for each group. From the written descriptions of their counseling procedures, it appeared that their methods were very similar. Actually four were or had been students of the fifth.

The Data

Only three types of data were used from Project No. 623: (1) kinescopes and tape recordings for two groups of adolescents; (2) tape recordings for three groups of prospective counselors; and (3) pre-, post-, and follow-up picture story protocols for four groups of adolescents and five groups of prospective counselors.

Method of Analyzing Data

For the Ohlsen and Oelke paper three steps were involved in the classification process: (1) a secretary transcribed each tape; (2) the rater scanned the transcription to obtain an overview of the session; and (3) the rater listened to the tape recordings with a transcription before him. For the adolescents, it also was necessary to play the kinescopes to identify the speaker. After the above process was completed for all the sessions, the data for each group was summarized into a single table. A

chi square test was used to determine whether chance could account for the observed differences.

To assess how adult clients influenced each other during counseling the rater used Moore and Proff (1960) revision of the Katz, Ohlsen, and Proff (1959) system for classifying interactions.

For the third paper in this project, competent clinicians were given several unidentified protocols (each consisting of five stories) for each client and asked to make a global judgment for each set of stories. Among other things the task required them to arrange the protocols in the order which they thought each client wrote them.

Unlike most of the previous research both the analysis of the counseling process and the growth achieved by clients were identified, described, and classified by someone other than the counselor. In these papers the junior authors had primary responsibility for analyzing the data.

Summary

From their combined experiences in analyzing the data for Project No. 623, the research staff concluded that certain response patterns warranted further study. Since these patterns were concerned with three different uses of the data, they are discussed separately here. Although some interesting things were learned, the analysis failed to produce the results which the investigators anticipated.

With reference to discussion topics Ohlsen and Oelke sought the answers to three questions: (1) Does it make a difference what topics clients discuss and who discusses them? (2) Do those who talk most about themselves actually make best gains? (3) Do clients who make most and least growth differ from the group as a whole? They found that when certain staff members met and discussed every client from the group they knew, in all except one group, they readily agreed on the two individuals who grew most and least (each group was represented by the person who observed the clients during counseling, the one who listened to the tapes and classified the interactions, the one who analyzed the test data, and the counselor). The investigators also concluded that there was no relationship between the topic discussed and the growth achieved by clients. What was the most productive topic for a client seemed to be a function of his own peculiar needs, his security within the group, and the ability of the group to communicate acceptance of him and his problems. Two topics were rarely discussed by any groups. Adolescents were more inclined than adults to discuss impersonal problems, low-affect topics. This is consistent with what is known about adolescent behavior, but it may not be an adequate explanation of what happened in these groups. The fact the adults sought help might better explain it. In general, those who grew most differed from their group as a whole in two ways: they talked more and they talked more about the members of the counseling group. The study produced no evidence

which clearly indicated that self talk was related to client growth. Further research may reveal that negative self talk is positively related to client growth.

The second paper was concerned with the extent to which composition of the group, and the manner in which members related to each other, influenced the development of a therapeutic climate. The investigators concluded that these relationships could not be adequately appraised and analyzed with only typescripts and tape recordings of counseling sessions. For example, they found that it was impossible to identify and classify withdrawal behavior from only tape recordings. Without the nonverbal cues which they used in the previous work, they also found that they were unable to adequately determine how one client reacted to another's behavior.

Finally, can competent clinicians take randomly arranged protocols and correctly arrange them from pre-testing through follow-up testing? Though agreement between judges was reasonably good, their ability to arrange protocols in correct order was not better than could be accounted for by chance. They were able to do this task somewhat better for adults than for adolescents. They also were most successful in differentiating between pre-testing protocols and follow-up testing protocols. Five cues were used most frequently in making these judgments: length of story, whether it had a positive outcome, whether the story was logical and well-integrated, client's willingness to exhibit his feelings, and evidence of hero's mastery of his environment. The last three cues provided valuable content for formulating new questions to be included in future content analysis of protocols.

References

Cowden, R. C., Deabler, H. L., and Feamster, J. H.,"The prognostic value of the Bender-Gestalt, HTP, TAT, and Sentence Completion Test," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1955, 11:271-275.

Katz, Evelyn W., Ohlsen, M. M., and Proff, F. C., "An Analysis Through Use of Kinescopes of Interpersonal Behavior of Adolescents in Group Counseling," The Journal of College Student Personnel, 1959, 1:2-10.

Moore, Virginia and Proff, F. C., "The analysis of verbal and nonverbal interactions in a small group through use of kinescopes," mimeograph paper, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1960.

Ohlsen, M. M. and Proff, F. C. The extent to which group counseling improves the academic and personal adjustment of underachieving gifted adolescents, Cooperative Research Project No. 623, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1960.

Rogers, C. R. and Dymond, Rosalind F., Psychotherapy and personality change, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954, pp. 109-144.

Talland, G. A. and Clark, D. H., "Evaluation of Topics in Therapy Discussion Groups," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1954, 10:131-137.

Zimmer, H., "Predictions by means of two projective tests of personalized evaluations by peers," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1955, 11:352-356.

Chapter II

Client Growth as a Function of Affect and Topic in Group Counseling

M. M. Ohlsen and M. C. Oelke

The content and feeling tone of the individual's verbal participation in group counseling sessions have been discussed relatively briefly in the literature. A long-term project at the University of Illinois has been investigating the application of group counseling techniques in educational settings, specifically with gifted underachievers and prospective counselors (Ohlsen and Proff, 1960). The present study presents a content analysis of counseling sessions with both types of subject.

In the process of analyzing data for some of the previous studies in this series, the investigators raised several questions concerning the content of the group counseling sessions. Moreover, staffing sessions suggested that the following major question might be examined profitably: To what extent is the nature of the verbal participation in group counseling related to improved mental health? Specifically, this was broken into three distinct but interrelated questions:

(1) Does it make a difference what topics clients discuss and who discusses them?

(2) Do those who talk most about themselves actually make the best gains?

(3) Do clients who make most and least growth differ from the group as a whole?

Few researchers have specifically analyzed the relationship between amount and kind of verbal participation and the growth which clients achieved. Most of these, however, have used groups in which the individuals probably deviated from the normal behavior patterns more than those used in the present study. Smith, Bassen, and Froelich (1960), in working with juvenile offenders, found no correlation between amount of verbal participation and change in attitudes. They felt that the degree of acceptance and understanding within the group were the greatest contributors to change in a situation where there was no pressure to talk.

Talland and Clark (1954) had a group of patients rate the topics which were the most helpful and most disturbing in group sessions and found that the topic discussed did make a difference. Topics involving sex were found most helpful in the eyes of the group and at the same time these topics were rated as most disturbing. At least for hospitalized groups they found

that generally the topics which were the most disturbing tended to be the most fruitful for growth. Hoch and Kaufer (1955) found that the topic discussed tended to change during therapy. At the beginning content tended to involve life in general, people, and the world. The content then moved toward the more concrete but was expressed in the third person, and finally during the last stage self-reference as such became more pronounced.

Hoch and Kaufer also found a definite pattern of interaction as did Winder and Hersko (1958). The latter indicated that hostility toward peers appeared early in therapy whereas self-insight appeared rather late as might be expected. They also found that themes tended to appear in clusters and to reappear at later sessions.

The present study attempted to examine somewhat similar areas in groups of relatively healthy individuals. The adolescents were gifted ninth grade students in an outstanding four-year high school with considerably better than average counseling services. From the four groups described by Broedel, Ohlsen, Proff, and Southard (1960), the two (14 clients) which were kinescoped were selected for this study. They were counseled twice a week for eight weeks.

The adult groups consisted of a total of 22 prospective counselors divided into three groups which met twice a week for seven weeks. Gazda and Ohlsen (1961) described four similar groups (including two of these three). Two selection criteria were essential for these adult groups: (1) the individuals all had problems with which they felt they needed help and (2) they were willing to talk about themselves. In evaluating the data these criteria take on major importance, especially the latter. It was very evident that most of the adults were committed to discussing themselves and their problems.

Procedure

All counseling sessions were electrically recorded but technical difficulties made it impossible to use all of the tapes for adult groups. No groups were used which had less than 10 sessions satisfactorily recorded. Both adolescent groups were complete. From these recordings, typescripts were made with all the client talk transcribed into "action units" (Ohlsen, Proff, and Wigell, 1960) for easier classification. An action unit is a grammatical unit consisting of a complete sentence or a clause containing a subject and a verb.

Each action unit was identified as to speaker by listening to the tape recording. For the adult groups this was sufficient, but for the adolescent groups it was impossible to identify the speaker from tapes alone. Since these two groups of adolescents had been kinescoped, these were used to insure accurate identification of the speaker. In this study kinescopes were not used for any purpose other than identification, however.

The categories of Ohlsen, Proff, and Wigell (1960) were then used to

classify each unit as to topic, referent, and affect. As they defined it, referent was the grammatical subject of the clause or sentence comprising the action unit. Referents were classified into one of the ten categories based essentially on first, second, or third person nouns and pronouns. Affect represented the feeling tone expressed by the speaker in each action unit and was classified as positive, negative, ambivalent, or no affect. Topics or problems discussed were placed in one or twelve classifications. These were defined as: (1) self, (2) self and others, (3) members of the counseling group, (4) counselor, (5) peers, (6) client's family, (7) authority figures, (8) other persons, (9) places, ideas, and things, (10) manipulating objects or doing things, (11) heterosexual or homosexual relations, (12) diversionary activities. These categories were very similar to those used for referent with the exception that the referent was the subject of the sentence where the topic was, in effect, the object of the sentence or paragraph. In some cases responses were inaudible or several individuals talked at once making it impossible to adequately transcribe the speech. When this occurred, such speeches or portions of speeches were ignored and not used in this study.

Ohlsen, Proff, and Wigell found that topics tended to extend over a larger unit of speech than a single action unit. Therefore, topics were classified on the basis of context covering several action units. One topic might be discussed for an entire speaking time, for a paragraph, or some lesser period; hence, a topic was considered to continue until a marked shift was noted. Although topic was considered in this more global fashion, each unit was classified as to topic within the context in which it appeared. In this fashion, each action unit was classified on each of the three dimensions.

The classification of all sessions for each group was done by a competent observer listening to the recording and following the typescript. Only one person worked on a group, but to insure consistency all classifiers were trained by the same person and regular cross checks were made on each other's work. It should be noted that Ohlsen, Proff, and Wigell demonstrated 75% to 95% agreement between judges using this technique. The lower figure represented the agreement on affect. In the present study, when any observer had a serious question concerning the classification of any unit, others were called in and agreement was reached concerning appropriate classification.

In the interests of comparability and consistency these categories were used for all groups in the study. However, the individuals who classified the verbalizations felt that some of the richness present in the adult sessions may have been missed in using these categories which were developed on adolescents. Though there were no serious classification problems, the observers felt that further study should be made of the possibility of developing additional categories for adult groups. These should include topics involving husband-wife relationships, money problems, vocational adjustment, and childhood memories and sub-dividing the family category into father, mother, siblings, and interrelationships among these. Most of these changes might be appropriate for younger clients too. Obviously, care should be taken to avoid getting so many categories that reliability would suffer.

The responses of each individual for each category were totaled over

all sessions in a 4 x 10 x 12 table to enable study of all possible interactions. Since Ohlsen, Proff, and Wigell found that referent contributed little or nothing toward understanding either the counseling process or the growth pattern of clients, it was not used in the final analysis of these data.

In order to obtain a rating of growth for each individual during the counseling sessions, all persons having any contact with the counseling sessions or the data met as a group and considered the extent of each individual's growth. These groups consisted of the therapist who had worked with the group, the person who had listened to the tapes and classified the action units, those who had observed the counseling sessions regularly, and the present investigators. To avoid contamination, these meetings were held before the classifications were summarized. After discussing each client and noting the specific ways in which each had changed during counseling, the group selected the two clients who had grown most and the two who had grown least. They also rated the growth of each client on a six-point scale. Though the various raters obtained their impressions of each client from quite different data, in most cases they agreed quickly on the person's rating and on the basis for that rating.

In only one group (C-2: adolescents) was there any difficulty achieving consensus. In all the other groups agreement was reached rapidly. In this group both the observers and the therapist questioned whether any one had achieved significant growth. However, the person who had analyzed the Picture Story protocols and the Behavior Inventory responses eventually convinced the rest that two clients had made significant growth. These two were very hostile individuals who prevented the group from ever becoming truly therapeutic, and the raters were concerned over whether these clients actually grew or simply had their anti-social behavior reinforced. Because of the nature of the group, consensus was reached only on the two who grew most and the two who grew least without regard to relative rank in each case.

Individuals were also selected for separate study to determine the relationship between amount of verbal participation and topic and affect. Verbal participation was determined by the number of action units for the individual. It was necessary to determine whether those individuals who talked most about themselves differed from their group in affect or topic. To make these comparisons a ratio was obtained for each client between total participation and number of action units classified as self topic.

Study of the data and recordings very quickly led to the conclusion that each group had certain unique characteristics that made it questionable to attempt to combine the groups or individuals in any meaningful way. For example, the counselor for adult group O used considerable interpretation, the counselor for adult group C used some interpretation and was more aggressive, and the counselor for adult group B tended to be cautious. In group O most group activity was concentrated positively on one member at a time with all other members trying to understand and help the speaker. In group C members expressed much hostility toward each other and made much less effort to understand each other. Because of these conditions, it was decided that the most reasonable way to treat the data was to compare the individual with

the group in which he was operating. Since the individual was always a part of the group and made his own unique contribution to any characteristics that group might have, it was felt appropriate to include all individuals in the group model.

By totaling the action units for each possible interaction, tables were constructed consisting of all the interactions for each group. This provided a pooled or theoretical model of each group against which each member was compared. Since the individual was always a part of the group standard, this gave a conservative estimate of any of the differences noted. Several statistical techniques were used in an attempt to determine the statistical significance of the differences between individuals and their groups. For example, the Chi Square Test was one usually used to test the differences between those growing most and least. When it was apparent that this would not be satisfactory, other non-parametric tests were tried or considered with much the same results. The very nature of the data frequently caused even very small differences to be significant statistically. Many of these did not appear to be meaningful differences; therefore, this paper discusses only the major differences.

Results

The results are discussed in terms of the three questions raised at the beginning of this paper. Groups are discussed only in relation to the total study.

An analysis of the topics discussed by all five groups could lead only to the conclusion that there was no general relationship between topic used and growth achieved during the counseling sessions. What a client discussed was a function of his own peculiar needs, his sense of security within the group, and the other members' ability to communicate understanding and acceptance of him and his problems. In one of the adult groups the client who grew most used the topic of sex most, but in the other two groups the topic of sex was discussed most by clients who grew least. This kind of variation was found for almost every topic. Two topics were rarely used by any group: (2) self and others and (4) counselor.

There was one consistent difference noted between the adolescent groups and the adult groups - even between adult group O and the adolescent groups which were counseled by the same counselor. The adolescents spent more time talking about things and ideas than did the adults. There are several reasons that could account for this behavior. When the adults were invited to participate, there were many more volunteers than could be treated. The reader will recall that they were then screened on the basis of their readiness for counseling. Though adolescents were told why they were selected and that they could decide whether to accept counseling, there was evidence noted in their comments during counseling which suggested that perhaps some of them were coerced by parents. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the adolescents had less commitment to counseling - were less ready to discuss their private feelings and disturbing thoughts. This is further supported by the fact that adolescents expressed less negative affect than all but one adult group, and perhaps the one of the three adult groups which grew least.

The adolescents' use of this topic with which there was associated little affect also may be a function of problems that are unique to adolescents: underdeveloped ego and super ego functions, fear of the opposite sex, and low tolerance of anxiety. Supporting these notions, Ackerman (1955) found that adolescents had a profound sense of vulnerability to criticism from without. Berman (1954) reported that adolescents were often brought to therapy against their will and made to feel that whatever the difficulty was that they were the culprits. Whether they entered therapy passive and seemingly compliant or overtly hostile, adolescents had misgivings about it. Thus one would expect them to behave differently in counseling than adults.

One other interesting trend did appear in the topic discussed. In both adolescent groups and in adult groups C and B, those individuals who grew most talked more about the group itself. Group O in which this trend was not evident had characteristics which could account for this difference. Analysis of the content and operation of this group gave the impression that it consisted primarily of individual counseling within the group.

The second area of investigation concerned the relationship between the amount of talk and talk about self and growth achieved. In general, the results here were consistent with the findings of Smith, Bassen, and Froelich (1960) in that for a specific individual the amount of talk may be related to either greater or lesser growth. On the other hand, when the amount of talk of the two subjects considered to have grown most was combined and compared with the amount of talk of the two subjects considered to have grown least, in four of the five groups (the three adult groups and the more productive of the adolescent groups) the individuals growing most had the highest amount of talk. It should be pointed out, however, that there was overlap and that there was no suggestion of a pattern that these were the individuals who had talked most in their respective groups.

This same condition obtained in an examination of self talk. Talk about self was without pattern. When the percentage of negative self talk was considered, with the combined percentages of those growing most being compared with the combined percentages of those growing least, in the majority of the groups (3 of 5) those growing most talked more of themselves negatively. The two exceptions involved the more productive adolescent group and adult group C where the individual growing least was probably the most disturbed individual in any of the groups. His high percentage of negative self talk (33%) was among the highest in the groups. It is probable that if this individual had been followed up during the ensuing therapy, greater growth would have been indicated. In the case of the adolescents, this group was the healthiest to begin with, and therefore they were secure enough to examine some of their negative feelings.

In the present study, nothing indicated that self talk as such was related to growth. There were inconsistencies found in group C-2 where the one who grew least had one of the highest percentages of negative self talk but, at the same time, the highest percentage of positive self talk, while the one who grew most had the highest percentage of negative self talk. It seems reasonable to assume that some of this difference may be attributable

to the relatively short treatment period. Readiness for counseling could be another explanation. One individual may have been just on the edge of real growth, one might have been somewhere in the middle, and another in effect completed since termination was not an individual matter. There is a possibility that a carefully controlled study would reveal that negative self talk is related to therapeutic progress.

The last question to be considered concerns whether or not those who grow most and least differ from the group as a whole. There was no variable studied which led to the conclusion that the individuals who grew most and least differed significantly from the group. No consistent patterns between groups were present on any of the variables. In one group the individuals who grew most used a higher proportion of their time than the group as a whole on a category, but in another group they would be found to be below the group on the same category. The individual who grew most or least could have more or less talk than the group average; no pattern of affect or topic existed with any consistency across all groups.

In only one way did those who grew most or least appear to differ at all. This was in the fact that in each group, those who grew most and least always appeared on opposite sides of the group totals. Furthermore, in each case there were individuals who were in the middle group who were more deviant than those who grew most and least. The analysis of these data seems to lend further credence to the point of view that growth is an individual thing whether in a group or in individual counseling, and progress can best be understood from the standpoint of the individual.

Summary and Conclusions

This study investigated the relationship between client growth and affect and client growth and topic during group counseling with both adults and adolescents. The present paper is particularly concerned with any differences associated with topic discussed, the relationship between amount of talk and growth, and whether those who grow most and least differed from the group as a whole.

The responses of three adult groups and two adolescent groups were analyzed with reference to topic, affect, and client growth. Within the framework set by this study and with the classification system used, there was no evidence which would warrant generalizations concerning these relationships except that growth in counseling is a function of the client's own pecularities.

References

Ackerman, N. W., "Group Psychotherapy With a Mixed Group of Adolescents," International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1955, 5:249-260.

Berman, S., "Psychotherapeutic Technique With Adolescents," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1954, 24:238-244.

Broedel, John, Ohlsen, Merle, Proff, Fred, and Southard, Charles, "The Effects of Group Counseling on Gifted Underachieving Adolescents," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7:163-170.

Gazda, George and Ohlsen, Merle, "The Effects of Short Term Group Counseling on Prospective Counselors," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1961, in press.

Hoch, Erasmus and Kaufer, George, "The Process Analysis of Transient Therapy Groups," International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1955, 5:415-21.

Ohlsen, M. M. and Proff, F. C., The Extent to Which Group Counseling Improves the Academic and Personal Adjustment of Underachieving Gifted Adolescents, Cooperative Project No. 623, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1960.

Ohlsen, Merle, Proff, Fred, and Wigell, Wayne, "To What Extent is Affect a Function of Topic and Referent?", mimeographed, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1960.

Smith, Alexander B., Bassen, Alexander, and Froelich, Abraham, "Change in Attitudes and Degree of Verbal Participation in Group Therapy With Adult Offenders," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24:247-50.

Talland, George A., and Clark, David H., "Evaluation of Topics in Therapy Discussion Groups," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1954, 10:131-37.

Winder, Alvin E., and Hersko, Marvin, "A Thematic Analysis of an Outpatient Psychotherapy Group," International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1958, 8:293-300.

Percentage of Total Interaction of Client Verbalizations Classified by Topic and Affect for Adolescent Group C-2

		Group Member									Group Member						
Topic	Affect	M* 1	2	3	M* 4	L** 5	L** 6	7	Topic	Affect	M* 1	2	3	M* 4	L** 5	L** 6	7
S	P	4.0	2.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	16.6	3.8	A	P	--	2.0	3.0	.6	--	1.0	3.7
	N	7.0	24.0	15.0	30.0	2.4	29.3	5.5		N	5.0	5.0	8.0	5.0	15.0	7.8	7.0
	A	--	--	.4	1.0	--	.5	.2		A	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	O	7.0	9.0	1.6	5.0	7.0	.5	1.9		O	.5	--	.5	3.0	10.0	2.4	4.0
Total		18.0	35.0	27.0	46.0	19.4	46.9	11.4	Total		5.5	7.0	11.5	8.6	25.0	11.2	14.7
W	P	3.0	--	.7	--	--	--	1.0	O	P	--	--	.3	--	--	.5	3.8
	N	1.0	.5	.3	--	--	--	.8		N	--	--	--	.3	--	--	5.1
	A	.5	--	.1	--	--	--	--		A	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	O	2.0	.5	.8	--	--	--	1.5		O	1.0	.5	.1	--	--	--	.6
Total		6.5	1.0	1.9	--	--	--	3.3	Total		1.0	.5	.4	.3	--	.5	9.5
G	P	5.0	2.0	3.0	--	2.4	--	2.0	N	P	3.0	1.0	3.0	2.0	15.0	2.4	3.7
	N	3.0	14.0	2.5	9.4	5.0	5.4	3.7		N	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	7.0	6.8	5.0
	A	--	--	.1	--	--	--	.1		A	--	--	--	--	2.4	--	.1
	O	6.0	--	.4	--	--	1.0	1.5		O	3.0	--	2.0	3.2	--	1.5	7.3
Total		14.0	16.0	6.0	9.4	7.4	6.4	7.3	Total		11.0	6.0	8.0	8.2	24.4	10.7	16.1
C	P	--	--	.1	--	2.4	.5	--	Do	P	3.0	2.0	11.2	6.0	--	5.9	6.5
	N	1.0	.5	.8	1.0	--	.5	.2		N	7.0	13.0	9.4	13.0	7.0	14.6	5.9
	A	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		A	--	--	.4	.4	7.0	--	--
	O	--	--	.1	--	--	--	.1		O	8.0	5.0	6.0	1.4	7.0	--	8.2
Total		1.0	.5	1.0	1.0	2.4	1.0	.3	Total		18.0	20.0	27.0	20.8	21.0	20.5	20.6
P	P	.5	3.0	.4	1.2	--	--	.8	Do	P	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	N	1.0	5.0	3.4	--	--	1.5	1.1	Sex	N	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	A	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		A	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	O	6.0	--	.2	1.0	--	--	.8		O	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total		6.5	8.0	4.0	2.2	--	1.5	2.7	Total		--	--	--	--	---	--	--
F	P	--	1.0	.4	.3	--	1.5	1.0									
	N	17.0	4.0	11.0	3.0	--	--	11.8									
	A	1.0	--	1.0	--	--	--	.2									
	O	.5	1.0	.9	.6	--	--	1.2									
Total		18.5	6.0	13.3	4.1	--	1.5	14.2									

*M - Most Growth
**L - Least Growth

Percentage of Total Interaction of Client Verbalizations Classified by Topic and Affect for Adolescent Group C-1

		Group Member										Group Member							
Topic	Affect	L** 1	2	3	4	5	6	M* 7	8	Topic	Affect	L** 1	2	3	4	5	6	M* 7	8
S	P	1.9	2.2	.35	.69	11.0	.48	1.7	2.5	A	P	3.0	1.9	1.3	2.0	8.5	.97	5.3	.35
	N	3.2	2.6	1.8	1.7	9.8	1.8	1.6	2.1		N	10.7	7.2	4.0	7.4	9.6	14.5	13.1	1.8
	A	.12	1.6	.07	--	--	--	.48	1.1		A	.61	.72	--	.58	--	--	.24	--
	O	1.2	2.2	1.1	1.5	3.7	1.0	.85	2.8		O	1.7	3.2	1.9	1.3	3.7	3.39	1.9	1.4
Total		6.4	8.6	3.3	3.9	24.4	3.2	4.6	8.5	Total		16.1	13.0	7.2	11.1	22.0	18.9	20.6	3.5
W	P	--	.08	.03	--	--	--	--	--0		P	--	--	--	--	--	.16	--	--
	N	--	--	--	.35	--	--	--	.70		N	1.3	.85	--	.23	--	1.6	.36	--
	A	.24	--	.14	--	--	.16	--	--		A	.12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	O	--	.77	.20	--	--	--	.36	--		O	.97	.66	.56	4.2	--	.48	.24	6.7
Total		.24	.85	.63	.35	--	.16	.36	.70	Total		2.4	1.5	.56	4.4	--	2.26	.60	6.7
G	P	1.5	.96	1.5	3.3	1.2	1.9	1.2	2.1	N	P	6.4	2.2	4.7	3.2	2.4	1.6	2.8	1.4
	N	3.5	3.4	8.5	5.5	1.2	2.9	6.9	14.8		N	7.8	6.5	11.6	7.7	15.9	2.58	9.1	3.9
	A	.61	.24	.42	.92	--	.32	.24	--		A	.12	.05	.14	.23	--	--	.12	--
	O	3.4	1.7	3.6	2.7	1.2	3.9	4.8	3.5		O	12.8	16.0	15.9	26.3	20.7	19.03	14.3	10.6
Total		9.0	6.3	14.1	12.5	3.6	9.0	13.2	20.4	Total		27.1	24.7	32.3	37.5	39.0	23.2	26.2	15.8
C	P	.61	--	--	.23	--	.16	--	--	Do	P	5.5	2.7	2.7	1.5	--	2.7	2.8	3.9
	N	.24	--	--	--	2.4	--	--	--		N	10.5	6.0	11.3	2.9	2.4	7.6	7.6	1.8
	A	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		A	.85	.29	.21	--	1.2	.16	.24	--
	O	.49	.05	--	--	1.2	1.5	--	--		O	6.1	4.3	8.9	11.9	1.2	7.3	7.1	13.0
Total		1.3	.05	--	.23	3.6	1.6	--	--	Total		22.9	13.3	23.1	16.3	4.8	17.7	17.8	18.7
P	P	2.9	1.7	1.4	2.2	--	3.1	.97	1.1	Do	P	--	.11	---	--	--	--	--	--
	N	4.0	13.8	6.6	2.9	1.2	7.1	4.6	12.7	Sex	N	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	A	.36	.04	.42	--	--	.32	.60	--		A	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	O	1.7	5.7	5.5	3.8	--	6.0	5.0	6.3		O	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total		9.0	21.6	13.7	8.9	1.2	16.5	10.9	20.1	Total		--	.11	--	--	--	--	--	--
F	P	3.6	.50	.84	1.3	--	2.9	.24	.70										
	N	1.2	8.5	3.6	2.5	1.2	3.2	4.0	3.5										
	A	.24	.29	--	.35	--	.48	--	1.1										
	O	.36	.66	.56	.69	--	.80	1.6	.35										
Total		5.5	9.9	5.0	4.8	1.2	7.4	5.8	5.6										

*M - Most Growth

**L - Least Growth

Percentage of Total Interaction of Client Verbalizations Classified by Topic and Affect for Adult Group O

		Group Member										Group Member							
Topic	Affect	M_2		M^*_1			L^{**}_1		L^{**}_2	Topic	Affect	M_2		M^*_1			L^{**}_1		L^{**}_2
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
S	P	4.0	4.0	4.0	1.0	4.0	29.0	15.0	--	S	P	.7	.1	.1	.4	2.0	--	3.0	--
	N	29.0	12.0	13.0	16.0	19.0	23.0	26.0	3.0		N	.4	--	.1	--	4.0	--	--	--
	A	3.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	--	--	--	--		A	--	--	.1	--	--	--	--	--
	O	2.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	29.0	4.0	6.0		O	--	.2	--	--	.2	--	--	--
Total		38.0	23.0	22.0	25.0	24.0	80.0	45.0	9.0	Total		1.1	.3	.3	.4	6.2	--	3.0	--
W	P	--	.1	--	--	--	--	--	--	O	P	--	--	--	.5	.7	--	.4	--
	N	--	5.0	--	--	--	--	--	8.0		N	2.0	--	--	4.0	2.0	--	--	--
	A	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		A	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	O	--	.8	--	--	--	--	--	--		O	.2	.2	--	--	--	--	6.0	--
Total		--	5.9	--	--	--	--	--	8.0	Total		2.2	.2	--	4.5	2.7	--	6.4	--
G	P	.1	3.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	10.0	1.0	--	N	P	--	.3	1.0	.9	.5	--	--	--
	N	.7	1.0	1.0	.5	3.0	--	1.0	--		N	2.0	1.0	2.0	5.0	1.0	--	--	--
	A	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		A	.1	--	--	--	.6	3.0	2.0	--
	O	--	.8	--	--	.7	--	--	--		O	.2	1.0	.4	.7	.4	--	--	3.0
Total		.8	4.8	5.0	3.5	8.7	10.0	2.0	--	Total		2.3	2.3	3.4	6.6	2.5	3.0	2.0	3.0
C	P	--	--	--	--	.1	--	--	--	Do	P	6.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	19.0	2.0	10.0	--
	N	--	.1	3.0	--	--	--	.4	--		N	26.0	28.0	10.0	21.0	12.0	--	26.0	19.0
	A	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		A	4.0	2.0	.4	2.0	.3	--	.7	1.0
	O	--	--	--	--	.1	--	--	--		O	2.0	5.0	.3	.9	.9	2.0	3.0	2.0
Total		--	.1	3.0	--	.2	--	.4	--	Total		38.0	42.0	18.7	31.9	32.2	4.0	39.7	22.0
P	P	.4	.8	.1	.5	.3	--	--	--	Do	P	2.0	1.0	5.0	3.0	11.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	N	.3	18.0	.3	.7	1.0	--	--	--	Sex	N	6.0	--	27.0	11.0	7.0	--	--	57.0
	A	.5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		A	.3	--	2.0	1.0	.2	3.0	--	--
	O	1.0	.8	--	--	.1	--	--	--		O	.5	--	2.0	.7	.5	--	--	2.0
Total		2.2	19.6	.4	1.2	1.4	--	--	--	Total		8.8	1.0	36.0	15.7	18.7	4.0	1.0	60.0
F	P	1.0	--	2.0	2.0	.3	--	--	--										
	N	3.0	--	10.0	8.0	.6	--	--	--										
	A	--	--	.4	--	--	--	--	--										
	O	2.0	.2	.4	.4	--	--	.7	--										
Total		6.0	.2	12.8	10.4	.9	--	.7	--										

*M_1 - Most Growth

M_2 - Second Most Growth

**L_1 - Least Growth

L_2 - Second Least Growth

Percentage of Total Interaction of Client Verbalizations Classified by Topic and Affect for Adult Group C

		Group Member									Group Member							
Topic	Affect	M_2		L_2	L_1^{**}	M_1^{*}			Topic	Affect	M_2		L_2	L_1^{**}	M_1^{*}		
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
S	P	8.0	7.9	1.6	6.9	5.1	4.3	6.6	A	P	.4	.1	--	.3	.2	.4	.2
	N	23.6	30.0	29.6	33.4	21.1	37.3	10.5		N	.1	.7	--	--	1.1	1.3	--
	A	2.0	.6	--	.4	.3	1.4	--		A	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	O	.3	.3	--	--	--	.1	--		O	--	.1	--	--	--	--	--
Total		33.9	38.8	31.2	40.7	26.5	43.1	17.1	Total		.5	.9	--	.3	1.3	1.7	.2
W	P	.2	.2	.1	.2	.4	.1	--	O	P	.6	.5	.6	.1	.4	.1	.2
	N	.8	.5	.2	.6	.3	--	.2		N	.7	2.5	2.1	2.2	.9	1.6	.6
	A	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		A	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	O	--	---	--	--	--	--	--		O	--	.1	--	.1	--	--	--
Total		1.0	.7	.3	.8	.7	.1	.2	Total		1.3	3.1	2.7	2.3	1.3	1.6	.8
G	P	6.0	5.5	1.8	2.6	5.6	1.9	6.2	N	P	.9	1.4	2.3	.7	.4	.8	1.4
	N	11.9	8.9	1.4	5.2	6.2	10.6	4.8		N	1.8	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.0	3.4	1.5
	A	.1	.1	--	.1	.1	--	.1		A	.1	--	--	.1	.1	--	--
	O	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		O	--	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.8
Total		17.9	14.5	3.2	7.9	11.9	12.5	11.2	Total		2.8	2.6	3.5	2.1	1.6	4.3	3.7
C	P	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	Do	P	3.3	5.3	3.4	3.9	4.3	2.3	7.8
	N	--	.2	--	.1	.1	--	--		N	10.8	13.5	22.2	18.2	17.7	16.1	14.9
	A	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		A	.1	.3	--	--	--	.4	--
	O	--	--	--	--	.1	--	--		O	.1	.1	.2	.1	.1	.1	.2
Total		--	.2	--	.1	.2	--	--	Total		14.3	19.2	25.8	22.2	22.1	18.9	22.9
P	P	--	--	--	--	--	--	.2	Dō	P	6.4	3.4	2.3	7.8	2.1	1.9	8.3
	N	--	1.2	--	.4	.1	--	1.6	SexN		12.6	10.9	21.3	9.1	29.7	11.0	15.1
	A	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		A	.2	.1	.8	--	.1	--	.4
	O	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		O	--	--	--	--	.1	.1	--
Total		--	1.2	--	.4	.1	--	1.8	Total		19.2	14.4	24.4	16.9	32.0	13.0	23.8
F	P	.7	1.7	.2	.2	.1	.1	1.2									
	N	8.3	2.8	8.9	1.8	2.3	4.7	3.1									
	A	.3	--	--	4.4	--	.2	28.7									
	O	--	--	--	--	--	--	--									
Total		9.3	4.5	9.1	6.5	2.4	5.0	33.0									

* M_1 - Most Growth

M_2 - Second Most Growth

** L_1 - Least Growth

L_2 - Second Least Growth

Percentage of Total Interaction of Client Verbalizations Classified by Topic and Affect for Adult Group B

Topic	Affect	Group Member 1	2	3	4	5	M_1^* 6	7	L_1^{**} 8	L_2 9
S	P	3.3	13.8	3.7	3.7	5.5	7.7	2.8	5.3	4.4
	N	10.0	4.3	23.9	4.8	4.2	14.2	3.9	8.0	2.3
	A	2.8	5.6	1.3	.54	1.4	.91	--	2.1	2.3
	O	5.3	7.4	5.7	5.6	4.3	3.7	3.5	5.2	9.7
Total		21.4	31.2	34.6	14.7	15.5	26.6	10.2	20.1	18.6
W	P	.46	1.3	.69	--	.20	--	--	.19	--
	N	.71	--	.69	1.3	.15	.30	--	--	--
	A	.61	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	O	.66	.76	--	.97	.40	--	1.5	--	--
Total		2.4	1.7	1.4	2.3	.75	.30	1.5	.19	--
G	P	5.1	1.3	11.2	13.7	5.2	15.8	3.3	15.4	2.3
	N	3.0	7.6	3.0	6.1	3.4	9.2	2.8	9.5	6.8
	A	--	2.6	.43	.07	--	.10	--	.10	--
	O	2.9	9.3	9.6	10.5	4.3	8.7	2.1	4.6	6.9
Total		11.0	18.6	24.3	30.4	13.3	33.8	8.2	29.7	15.3
C	P	--	--	--	.07	.20	--	--	--	--
	N	--	--	--	--	.40	--	.55	.87	--
	A	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	O	--	--	.35	.04	.54	--	--	--	--
Total		--	--	.35	.11	1.1	--	.55	.87	--
P	P	1.1	.26	.79	.83	--	--	.37	5.1	7.6
	N	2.3	.26	.61	.90	--	.81	1.7	--	1.8
	A	.35	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1.6
	O	3.6	.76	--	.22	.30	--	3.3	.19	2.7
Total		7.4	1.2	1.4	1.9	.30	.81	5.4	5.3	13.7
F	P	--	--	--	1.8	.15	.91	11.5	--	--
	N	.91	4.1	--	1.2	.25	2.6	13.9	--	4.2
	A	.56	--	--	.54	--	--	--	--	--
	O	1.2	--	1.1	2.1	.10	.61	9.3	--	1.8
Total		4.6	4.1	1.1	5.6	.49	4.1	34.6	--	6.0

Topic	Affect	Group Member 1	2	3	4	5	M_1^* 6	7	L_1^{**} 8	L_2 9
A	P	.35	--	--	.04	1.7	--	.18	--	--
	N	1.3	--	--	1.4	.11	1.0	--	.68	2.1
	A	--	--	--	.04	--	--	--	--	--
	O	.10	--	.61	.47	.45	.20	1.5	--	1.4
Total		1.7	--	.61	2.0	3.2	1.2	1.7	.68	3.5
O	P	3.0	5.4	.87	1.2	4.5	1.7	--	2.2	2.1
	N	5.9	2.6	4.8	8.7	12.3	4.4	2.2	8.8	6.1
	A	--	--	--	--	.30	--	--	.10	.34
	O	5.6	2.6	3.4	3.5	6.5	1.7	3.1	.59	2.9
Total		14.4	10.5	9.1	13.4	2.4	7.9	5.4	17.1	11.5
N	P	4.7	4.3	2.0	1.9	2.8	4.8	3.7	.27	3.9
	N	7.9	5.6	4.7	5.9	14.5	4.1	5.5	4.3	5.8
	A	1.6	--	.09	.18	.45	--	.74	--	--
	O	13.6	9.7	8.6	10.2	12.1	8.4	9.8	9.9	7.2
Total		27.8	19.7	15.3	18.2	29.9	17.3	19.8	17.0	17.0
Do	P	3.2	--	1.9	1.9	.99	2.0	2.6	4.1	--
	N	1.4	1.5	3.9	2.1	2.1	.81	.37	1.4	--
	A	.46	--	1.2	--	.99	.10	--	--	--
	O	5.6	11.2	3.9	4.8	5.2	2.6	3.5	3.1	1.6
Total		10.6	12.7	11.0	8.8	9.3	5.6	6.5	8.5	1.6
Do SexN	P	--	--	.52	1.5	.74	--	.37	--	4.2
	N	.25	--	--	.36	.89	1.6	--	--	.45
	A	--	--	--	.18	.64	--	--	--	3.6
	O	--	--	.35	.54	.49	.91	--	--	4.6
Total		.25	--	.87	2.6	2.8	2.5	.37	--	12.8

* M_1 - Most Growth

M_2 - Second Most Growth

** L_1 - Least Growth

L_2 - Second Least Growth

L_3 - Third Least Growth

Chapter III

The Influence of Composition of the Group on Interpersonal Behavior in a Counseling Group

Fred Proff and Robert Clever

Tape recordings of group counseling sessions with prospective counselors (Gazda and Ohlsen, 1961) were used in an attempt to classify interpersonal behavior and to determine how composition of the group, and the manner in which group members related to each other, influenced the development of a therapeutic climate and growth of clients. Horney's mutually exclusive categories (approach, attack, and withdrawal) were employed. Previously, this system was used by Katz, Ohlsen, and Proff (1959, 1960) in their analysis of kinescopes of interpersonal behavior of adolescents recorded during group counseling.

Several limitations of analyzing tape recordings were encountered. The major limitation seemed to be that in most instances it was impossible to identify and classify accurately withdrawal behavior using only the auditory cues. Only the speaker's behavior could be classified, and even it could not be classified accurately without nonverbal cues. Thus, for example, it was impossible to determine how a member reacted to another member's attack behavior.

A second major limitation was the difficulty of identifying the principals of an interaction. Thus, it was impossible to determine how one client's behavior really affected others.

The interactions of two adult groups were studied. For the first group the person (not the counselor) doing the classifications knew all the clients, and thus was able to quickly recognize each speaker. However, it was found that this familiarity increased rating bias and reduced objectivity to such an extent that it seriously impaired the accuracy of classifications. For the second group the rater knew none of the clients. With this group he made significantly more errors in identifying the speaker, but increased significantly his objectivity in classifying behavior. Laughing, muffled talk, short comments, and several persons talking at once were the major sources of difficulty in identifying the speakers.

Because of the difficulties cited above, these investigators do not recommend that tape recordings be used alone for this purpose. Typescripts of counseling sessions obtained from tape recordings may be used profitably in conjunction with kinescopes or videotape recordings.

References

Gazda, G. and Ohlsen, M. "The effects of short-term group counseling on prospective counselors." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1961, in press.

Katz, Evelyn W., Ohlsen, M. M., and Proff, F. C. "An analysis through use of kinescopes of the interpersonal behavior of adolescents in group counseling." Journal of College Student Personnel, 1959, 1, 2-10.

Katz, Evelyn W., Ohlsen, M., and Proff, F. "A further analysis of the interpersonal behavior on adolescents in group counseling, mimeograph paper, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1960.

Chapter IV

Group Counseling Evaluated by Blind Analysis of Projective Test Responses

Merle Ohlsen and Harold Johnson

The purpose of this study was to determine whether clinicians could take randomly arranged protocols from picture test stories and arrange them in correct order from pre-testing to follow-up testing.

Previous studies (Broedel, Ohlsen, Proff, and Southard, 1960; Gazda and Ohlsen, 1961) with these data indicated that content analysis of these protocols showed some promise in evaluating growth of clients treated in groups. For most of the gifted underachieving ninth graders, the post-counseling responses were rated significantly better than the pre-counseling ones, and these changes tended to be maintained. For the adults, however, only the changes between pre-counseling testing and follow-up testing proved to be significant. When these results were discussed at the final meeting of the original research staff for this project, the staff members agreed that there were clients who had made significant growth, but were not identified on the detailed content analysis of clients' responses. They concluded that a clinical evaluation of the general affective tone for the entire group of stories written at each testing period should enable competent judges to arrange protocols for these clients in sequence from pre-counseling testing to follow-up testing. In other words, they believed this global judgment should enable them to identify these additional clients who had seemed to make significant growth.

Because many factors used in such a global interpretive judgment of adjustment are undoubtedly overlooked in a more molecular analysis of the stories, the authors assumed that additional information might be obtained by using the approach commonly employed in a clinical-diagnostic setting. For example, sequence analysis (Henry, 1956) is seldom undertaken in a content analysis but frequently is a useful procedure in the diagnostic setting. Further, the general affective tone of the total protocol, the defensiveness, and the level of impulse control are likewise often unaccounted for in a detailed content scoring system. However, these are useful cues in the evaluation of protocols in less research oriented settings. Thus the investigators felt that even if the accuracy of such global judgments was not sufficient to warrant continued use as research criteria, the requirement that the clinicians attempt to state the cues that they used in their evaluations might nevertheless yield very useful information for the improvement of the more detailed scoring systems.

There are several studies which lend support for "blind" analysis in the evaluation of personality characteristics and the assessment of adjustment of Ss before and after counseling. Rogers and Dymond (1954) reported a similar study in which raters were required to rate the level of adjustment of a number of unidentified TAT protocols. Their results

indicated that the raters judged protocols taken before therapy as less well-adjusted than those obtained after therapy; a result that coincided with several other measures such as self-description, judgment of therapists, and external adjustment criteria.

Other studies have been reported in which such analyses were undertaken on different projective tests or combinations of several such tests. Cowden, Deabler, and Feamster (1955) reported that judges using the Bender-Gestalt, HTP, TAT and Sentence Completion Test selected the less well-adjusted patients with greater accuracy than they selected members of an experimental group who had been carefully appraised in the usual staffing prior to discharge. Zimmer (1955) also reported success in using an independent analysis of the Sentence Completion Test and Human Figure Drawings to predict criterion scores on a number of personality traits. The correlations between criteria and judgments from the "blind" analyses were in the neighborhood of .15. However, the task required of the raters in this case was a much more difficult one than the more global rating of level of adjustment required in this study.

Samuels (1952) indicated that ratings based on various projective techniques were correlated with several criterion measures at a significant level more often than was expected by chance. But as in Zimmer's study these correlations were generally quite low.

It appears that even when prediction from the "blind" analyses is to a number of personality traits, the raters do better than might be expected by chance. When the prediction is to a criterion of adjustment level, the results of the "blind" analyses are far more promising.

Method

Ss

The Ss used for this study came from two different populations: (1) 27 gifted underachieving ninth graders, Group P (Broedel, Ohlsen, Proff, and Southard, 1960) and (2) 41 teachers who were preparing for counseling positions, Group M (Gazda and Ohlsen, 1961). A detailed description of the entire project was reported earlier (Ohlsen and Proff, 1960).

The picture test was administered to the adolescents pre-, post-, and either 15 or 18 months after counseling was terminated. All of the adults completed the picture stories in pre- and post-testing; those who lived within a radius of 200 miles of the campus were brought back to the campus for a fourteen-month follow-up testing. Five pictures were used in the test: Card II of Murray's TAT; Card I of the Michigan Picture Test; and Cards I, IV, and V of Alexander's and Cronbach's adaptation of the TAT.

The protocols were typed in their original form (including Ss misspelled words, poor grammar, etc.) from Ss handwritten protocols and were

coded so that it was not possible for judges to ascertain when protocols were written.

Judges

The judges were third-year graduate students in psychology who had completed three years of training including a semester of course work and a year of hospital experience in the use of diagnostic instruments such as TAT.[1] They were judged to be competent to make the type of global ratings required by this study. The raters were given the following instructions before they began their rating task:

"The aim of these ratings is to see how well psychologists can assess, through the use of projective tests, growth and adjustment following counseling. The material to be rated contains five stories for each S, one set obtained before group counseling was instituted, the other following the termination of counseling. There are two stories from each card for each S. The sets of pre- and post-stories are identified by a code number for each S and his stories are on two separate sheets stapled together in a random pre-post order.

"The task we would like you to perform is to make a global judgment of each set of stories. Decide which set of stories is pre- and which is post-counseling on whatever basis you feel is a sound one. We are interested here in a global interpretation of the entire set of stories, not in individual stories.

"We also are interested in any comments you want to make on the stories and we want you to make explicit the reason for your judgments. Also rate the confidence you have in the judgment on a three-point scale: (1) certain (shows real growth from pre- to post-); (2) fairly certain (some indication of growth); (3) uncertain (protocols are very similar in terms of growth or adjustment--a guess)."

Since the treatment period was only eight weeks for the adolescents and seven weeks for the adults, the authors felt that perhaps significant growth would not be noted until follow-up testing. In fact they concluded, especially for the adults, that clients might appear to be less well-adjusted at post-testing than at pre-testing. Inasmuch as these subjects were reasonably well-adjusted at pre-testing, they would be expected to be able to consolidate gains and to become better integrated during the follow-up period. Therefore, it was logical to make a second attack on the task using pre-, post-, and follow-up test protocols. Several months after the initial "blind" analysis ratings, three of the same four judges repeated the procedure, but with three protocols per S instead of two as in the first ratings.

The judges also were told the general nature of the two groups of persons whom they were judging, the durations of counseling, and the age-range for each group. Inasmuch as one judge had worked with one of the

adult groups, but had never seen any of the protocols, names were removed from the protocols. This was done in an effort to insure that judgments were made independent of the criteria.

Criterion

Since the clients' behavior for both types of groups had been analyzed previously, it was possible to obtain a team judgment of growth achieved by clients. The teams consisted of an observer who had analyzed from either tape recordings or kinescopes clients' interactions during counseling, a clinical observer who observed all the sessions for the adolescents, the counselor, and a moderator who chaired the sessions. The moderator had had no previous contacts with the data; his primary task was to insure that the judgments made for each group were arrived at in a similar manner. During the discussion the members of the team selected the client from each group who had grown most and the one who had grown least. Then they selected, where possible, from those left the one who had grown most and least. Finally every client was placed in one of the following six categories:

(a) marked positive change; (b) positive (significant) change; (c) no change or minor positive change; (d) no change or minor negative change; (e) negative change; and (f) marked negative change.

Results

For discussion purposes judges' "blind" ratings have been divided into four categories: (1) the extent to which judges agreed without reference to any criterion of growth, (2) the accuracy with which judges arranged protocols pre- to post- (absolute criterion); (3) the accuracy with which judges arranged protocols pre- to post- to follow-up (also absolute criterion); and (4) the extent to which "blind" analysis agreed with the team criterion judgment.

Agreement Between Judges

For Group P the average agreement between all possible pairs of the four judges was 73% with the poorest pair agreeing 59% of the time and the best pair agreeing 85% of the time. Taking one client at a time, three out of four judges agreed on their judgments for 81% of the cases while all four judges agreed on only 56% of them.

The amount of interjudge agreement for the M group (adults) was quite similar. The average percent agreement between all pairs of judges was 70% with the highest level of agreement being 80% and the lowest 61%. Three of four judges agreed on 88% of the cases while all four judges agreed only 44% of the time. Even a cursory analysis of Table 1 reveals that one judge (No. 3) accounted for much of the disagreement between judges.

When judges were required to arrange protocols for all three testings, the agreement between judges was reduced. For Group P the agreement between pairs of judges ranged from 51% to 60% with a mean of 56%. For Group M (adults) the agreement ranged from 48% to 64% with a mean of 57%.

Agreement With Absolute Criterion

The average percent of correct rating to this pre-post criterion for the four judges, 48% for Group P. The range for individual judges was from 44% to 56% correct. Again, three of four judges correctly arranged 41% of the protocols and all four agreed correctly on only 22% of them.

However, the accuracy of the ratings was increased somewhat for the second group of protocols (M group). For this group the average for the judges was 61% correct with the best judge correctly arranging 66% and the worst arranging the protocols accurately for 56% of the Ss. Three of the four judges were correct 56% of the time, but all four were correct on only 32% of the protocols.

When using only pre- to post- protocols, it is apparent that the judges were unable to correctly arrange the stories of the P group at a better than chance level. However, they did improve somewhat in their ratings of the M group.

When judges were required to arrange the three protocols in sequential order for each client, the results were poor. For Group P the judges arranged protocols correctly on the average 35% of the time (range for individual judges, 29% to 42%). However, once again they did somewhat better for Group M: range for individual judges, 43% to 71%, with mean of 55%.

On the other hand, some support was found for the authors' hunch that follow-up stories would be more easily identified. For Group P the judges correctly identified the follow-up protocols 40% of the time (chose them over pre-test 49% of the time, and chose them over post-test 47% of the time). The same percentages for Group M were 67% (76% and 71%).

Team Judgment Criterion

When the investigators compared the "blind" ratings for those who grew most with those who grew least (or made no growth), the results were encouraging. The judges' success in correctly arranging protocols are listed as ratios between those who grew most and those who grew least (most:least): protocols for Group P pre- to post- (71%:38%) and for Group M (the adults) the ratios were pre- to post- (67:50).

Next the success of "blind" analysis was evaluated by comparing those who made significant growth (categories a and b) with those who

made little or no growth (only 2 clients were classified into any of the negative change categories: d, e, and f). The judges correctly arranged the adolescents' protocols for those who were judged to have made significant growth versus those who failed to make significant growth with the following success (growth: no growth): pre- to post- (47%:43%). The same data for Group M are: pre- to post- (70%:64%). In other words, the judges were not able to differentiate between those who had made significant growth and those who had not.

Cues Used by Judges

Finally the investigators analyzed the judges' reasons for their decisions.

1. Though not used alone, length of story was most often used in making these judgments. Apparently, the judges assumed that other things being equal, the longer and more involved stories reflected greater productivity and responsiveness to environment. However, they also recognized that length of story could be a negative sign.

2. Positive outcome was next most frequently considered. They looked especially for evidence of hope for the future and the reality orientation of outcomes.

3. Stories which had a high degree of coherence, and which held together logically, were seen as evidence of better adjustment. They also looked for evidence of well-integrated thoughts.

4. Another cue often used was ability to display feelings freely--a willingness to expose oneself.

5. Finally, the judges looked for evidence of a client's mastery of his environment. They looked for instances in which the hero was able to face reality in his environment, to make decisions, and to take responsibility for his actions -- even to manipulate his environment.

The last three cues suggest new content for questions which will be added to those currently used in content scoring for this project.

Discussion

The above results indicate a number of things concerning global, "blind" analyses of projective test responses. First, although the agreement and accuracy of the judgments leave much to be desired, it seems apparent that the judges did contribute something by their ratings, over and above chance fluctuations. The accuracy of the judgments did increase as the criterion was made more meaningful. That is, though the judges did poorly overall in rating pre and post counseling protocols, their accuracy

was increased with most improved Ss.

In considering the "blind" analysis technique several assumptions were made which must be more closely scrutinized. First, it was assumed that changes due to counseling are reflected directly in the protocols. That is, after a person has completed counseling his protocols will appear healthier. As we pointed out earlier, this is not necessarily the case. It is entirely possible that short-term counseling may have the effect of making the individual appear less well-adjusted than he was prior to counseling. Further, some clients might have made gains in counseling, but because of the short duration of treatment, they were not able to integrate their new perceptions of self and ways of living, and therefore they appeared to be more confused and less integrated. This type of problem was pointed up quite dramatically in the data for one case. One S who was judged to have improved most by all other criteria gave these judges all kinds of trouble. They always judged his protocols as better adjusted before counseling than after.

Though follow-up testings were used to evaluate this possiblity, data were obtained on too few subjects to make the most relevant comparison. For example, the limited number of Ss made it impossible to compare pre to follow-up and post to follow-up evaluations with the team judgment criterion.

Problems involved in assessing changes in clients over time as a result of counseling cannot be solved in a study like the present one, but must be studied in more carefully controlled longitudinal analyses to determine the type of changes which are reflected in projective tests as well as their direction across time. With the present gaps in our knowledge concerning projectives, one cannot expect a high degree of accuracy in simple "blind" ratings.

A problem closely related to the above-mentioned one involved those individuals who were judged as not deriving benefit from therapeutic counseling. In the present study the judges were asked to rate the confidence of their judgments on a three-point scale, (1) denoting a high degree of confidence and (3) indicating little confidence or nearly a guess. Analysis of these confidence ratings indicated that the highest proportion of guesses (3 ratings) were attached to stories written by Ss who had ratings of C or below. Similarly the highest percentage of confident (1) ratings were found among the Ss rated in the "improved" (A and B) categories. Thus it appears that the judges not only did better in judging protocols from Ss who made the greatest gains, but they also were more confident of these judgments. The question of what changes took place in the low growth protocols remains unanswered except that they were more difficult to rate and less clear-cut than those of high gain Ss. Differences such as these could be due to several factors. First, perhaps these Ss were simply poor prognostic bets for short-term counseling, and their protocols reflected quite directly the minimal changes which one would expect from such a population. However, there is nother alternative explanation.

This group also might have included some Ss who were relatively well-adjusted to begin with, and their lack of dramatic changes as a result of counseling simply indicated that they had less to gain from counseling at the outset.

The analysis of the judges' comments on the protocols and their reasons for making the ratings as they did yielded some interesting leads for using picture story tests to appraise client growth. The investigators recommend that in future studies a specific set of well-defined cues be used in making this type of global judgment. Some of these cues also may be meaningfully included in already established content analyses to get a better assessment of adjustment.

The final question which must be considered concerning analysis of the type studied here is whether or not they will add anything to presently available criterion scores for adjustment. Although one can only speculate at this point, it seems that the answer is affirmative. There is no question that the present analyses left much to be desired, but the judges did make reasonably reliable judgments. Further it is apparent that they did base their judgments on global aspects of test behavior which are often overlooked in detailed scoring analyses. Perhaps, a more formalized global rating would produce better judgments.

[1]The following persons served as judges: William Carlson, Cooper, Rogers Elliott, and Kenneth Stark.

References

Broedel, J., Ohlsen, M., Proff, F., and Southard, C. "The effects of group counseling on gifted underachieving adolescents," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7:163-170.

Cowden, R. C., Deabler, H. L., and Feamster, J. H. "The prognostic value of the Bender-Gestalt, HTP, TAT, and Sentence Completion Test," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1955, 11:271-275.

Gazda, G., and Ohlsen, M. "The effects of short-term group counseling on prospective counselors," a mimeographed paper, College of Education, University of Illinois, Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1961, in press.

Henry, W. E. The analysis of fantasy, New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1956.

Ohlsen, M. M. and Proff, F. C. The extent to which group counseling improves the academic and personal adjustment of underachieving gifted adolescents, Cooperative Research Project No. 623, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1960.

Rogers, C. R. and Dymond, Rosalind F. Psychotherapy and personality change, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954, pp. 109-144.

Samuel, H. "The validity of personality trait ratings based upon projective techniques," Psychological Monographs, 1952, 66 (No. 5), Whole No. 337, 1952.

Zimmer, H. "Predictions by means of two projective tests of personalized evaluations made by peers," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1955, 11:352-356.

Table 1

Agreement Between Judges
(Pre- and Post- Judgments)

Pairs of Judges	Group P	Group M
1 & 4	74%	66%
2 & 4	81	76
3 & 4	74	80
1 & 2	85	61
1 & 3	59	71
2 & 3	67	66
$\bar{x}$	73	70
3 of 4	81	88
all 4	56	44

Table 2

Agreement Between Judges
(Pre- Post- follow-up)

Pairs of Judges	Group P	Group M
1 & 2	58%	64%
1 & 3	60	60
2 & 3	51	48
$\bar{x}$	56	57

Table 3

Agreement with Order of Testing
(Pre-Post)

Judge	Group P	Group M
1	56%	66%
2	48	61
3	44	56
4	44	61
$\bar{x}$	48	61
3 of 4	41	56
4 of 4	22	32

Table 4

Agreement with Order of Testing
(Pre- Post- Follow-up)

Judge	Group P	Group M
1	33%	50%
2	42	71
3	29	43
$\bar{x}$	35	55